



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,504	08/10/2001	Youichi Itaki	Q65789	4993
7590 04/23/2004				
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037				
EXAMINER MENGISTU, AMARE				
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER				
2673				

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,504

Applicant(s)

ITAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Amare Mengistu

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the **“display region is painted out in black”; “an adjustment menu for adjusting the generated first basic picture”; “a color adjustment menus”; “a remote control unit”** must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 10-14, 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification as originally filed does not disclose the recitation of the claims 10-14, 19-23 **“because the information quality of said second on-screen picture is**

Art Unit: 2673

essentially zero, the first on-screen picture alone is projected on said display region"

"Said erasure unit is configured such that the outline of the portion of said display region painted out in black remains as the frame line";

"Said on-screen picture comprises an adjustment menu for adjusting the generated first basic picture";

"Said first on-screen picture comprises a color adjustment menus";

"Wherein said master display unit is configured to be manipulated by means of a remote control unit while watching said adjustment menu to execute various kinds of adjustments"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1,2 8,16, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Koyama et al (US 2002/0159035 A1)**(see, figs. 1,6(A) –6 (E')).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-9,11,15-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fujiwara et al** (2001/0013843 A1) In view of **Corley** (5,077,154).

As to claims 2-9,11,15-18, **Fujiwara et al** discloses an image display device including a master display (figs. 2 and 3 (11), page 3, col.2, [0052]) having a first picture init configured to generate a first picture and a first on screen display unit configured to generate a first on screen picture that is superimposed on said first basic picture (figs.2 and 3 master display (11); screen (20); page 3, col.1 [0044], [0045]); and a slave display unit (figs.2 and 3 (12-14), page 3, col2 [0053]) including a second picture display unit and a second on screen display unit (figs.2 and 3 a slave display (12-14); screen (20); page 3, col.1 [0044], [0045]) that display a plurality of pictures coinciding position on a projection screen (20), the master display unit (11) generates an on screen picture (page 3, col.1, [0044]), the data corresponding to the master display unit are transmitted to the first, second and third slave display unit (fig.2,3 master(11), slave (12,13,14)). It would be obvious to one skill in the art to recognize that one can select one of the display units as a master or a slave in case of malfunction.

Art Unit: 2673

Fujiwara et al has failed to teach that the slave display unit equipped with an erase unit, which erases the portion of the image in a display region. However, the patent of **Corley** is cited to teach that it is well known of a slave display unit to have an erase unit to erase/shading portion of the image (see, fig.1 [O], col.1, lines 23-32) and the erase portion is black/shading in black (see, figs.2b [24], 3b).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have used erasing portion of the image as taught by **Corley** into the slave display device of **Fujiwara et al**, since this will allow the user to have the ability to mask an wanted portion of the image not to be seen by others.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2673

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2673

A.M
April 19, 2004